

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 5-6 are canceled. Claims 1-4, and 7-69 remain in this application and, as amended herein, are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 7-16, 21-27, 36-55, and 67-69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooper (U.S. Patent No. 6,754,904) in view of Zenith (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,771) and further in view of Otani (U.S. Patent No. 6,425,011). Applicant submits that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

For example, claim 1 as amended calls for:

a display unit operable to display a user list identifying the plurality of users of said client device, to receive a user-entered password when the given one of the plurality of users is selected, and when said client device verifies that the user-entered password corresponds to the particular one of the plurality of passwords that is associated with the given one of the plurality of users, to display content based on the received content data, to display a plurality of icon buttons associated with the plurality of icons such that a given one of the plurality of icon buttons represents a particular one of the plurality of icons, and to display a plurality of representations associated with a plurality of members of a buddy list that is associated with that user such that a given one of the plurality of representations is associated with a specific one of the plurality of members of the buddy list and includes a portion providing a particular one of a plurality of visual clues which indicates an on-line status of a client device associated with that member, said display unit being operable to display the portion providing the particular one of the plurality of visual clues in place of the given one of the plurality of representations in its entirety[.]
(Emphasis added.)

Neither the relied-on sections of Cooper, the relied-on sections of Zenith, nor the relied-on sections of Otani disclose nor suggest that a client device verifies that a

user-entered password corresponds to a particular password associated with a given user. Moreover, neither the relied-on sections of Cooper, the relied-on sections of Zenith, nor the relied-on sections of Otani disclose or suggest displaying a portion providing a particular visual clue in place of the representation in its entirety.

The Examiner acknowledges that "Cooper as modified by Zenith fails to explicitly teach verifying a selected user" but contends that "Otani teaches... verifying selected user(s) of a plurality of users, using the user-entered password or access data associated with the user" and refers to Figs. 10-12; column 1, col. 1, lines 12-37; col. 2, lines 5-39; col. 6, lines 1-16; and col. 16, lines 13-67. However, the relied-on sections of Otani describe a server that performs user verification. (See Figs. 10-12, col. 1 lines 19-25, and col. 2 lines 5-10.) The relied-on sections of the reference neither disclose nor suggest that a client device verifies the user.

The Examiner also contends that Cooper teaches:

A display unit [] operable to... display a plurality of visual clues [] associated with a plurality of members of a buddy list associated with that user such that a given one of the plurality of visual clues is associated with a given one of the plurality of members of a buddy list [] associated with a user and indicates an on-line status of a client device associated with that member, the plurality of visual clues being smaller than a depiction of a plurality of members of the buddy list, the display list being operable to display the depiction of the plurality of members of the buddy list in place of the plurality of visual clues.

Here, the Examiner relies on Figs. 4-5 and 11; col. 1, line 44 to col. 2, line 34; col. 3, line 56 to col. 4, line 1; and col. 6, line 40 to col. 7, line 1. However, the relied-on sections of Cooper merely teach displaying a list of names of each member of a buddy list together with the name of the show

or the network being watched by that member or that the member is not currently logged on. (See Fig.11, and col.7 ll.4-10.) The relied-on sections of Cooper neither disclose nor suggest displaying the portion that shows whether a user is currently logged on in place of a listing in its entirety.

The relied-on sections of Zenith and the relied-on sections of Otani do not address the deficiencies of the relied-on sections of Cooper.

It follows, for at least the above reasons, that neither the relied-on sections of Cooper, the relied-on sections of Zenith, nor the relied-on sections of Otani, whether taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the device set out in claim 1, and therefore claim 1 is patentably distinct and unobvious over the cited references.

Independent claim 24 and independent claim 50 includes features similar to those set out in the above excerpt of claim 1. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claims 24 and 50 are each patentably distinct and unobvious over relied-on sections of Cooper, Zenith, and Otani.

Claims 2-4, 7-16, and 21-23 depend from claim 1, claims 25-27 and 36-49 depend from claim 24, and claims 51-56 and 67-69 depend from claim 50. Therefore, each of these claims is distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons as its parent claim.

The Examiner also rejected claims 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooper in view of Zenith and further in view of Otani (as applied to claim 15) and DeWeese (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0262542); and rejected claims 28-35, and 57-66 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooper in view of Zenith and further in view of Otani (as applied to claims 25 and 55) and further in view of DeWeese. Applicant submits that the claims are

patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claims 17-20 depend from claim 1, claims 28-35 depend from claim 24, and claims 57-66 depend from claim 50. Therefore, each of claims 28-35 and 57-66 is distinguishable over the relied on sections of Cooper, Zenith, and Otani for at least the same reasons as the claim from which it depends.

The relied on sections of DeWeese do not remedy these deficiencies.


Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: August 3, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Lawrence E. Russ
Registration No.: 35,342
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant